

APPENDICES

FOR

**THE COST OF FULFILLING THE REQUIREMENTS OF
THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT FOR SCHOOL
DIVISIONS IN VIRGINIA – Issued by Augenblick, Palaich
and Associates, Inc.**

AND

**REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR AND GENERAL
ASSEMBLY ON THE COSTS OF THE FEDERAL NO
CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT TO THE VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – Issued by the Virginia
Department of Education**

September 21, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A – COMPONENT SUMMARY/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR EACH OF THE EIGHT PARTICIPATING LOCAL SCHOOL DIVISIONS	2
Albemarle County.....	3
Fairfax County	4
Fredericksburg City	9
Halifax County.....	10
Henrico County.....	11
Norfolk City	12
Roanoke County.....	14
Washington County	18
APPENDIX B – EXPLANATION OF SEA CONTRIBUTION TO LOCAL EFFORTS AS SHOWN IN FIGURE 2 OF THE APA REPORT.....	19
APPENDIX C – GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	20

**APPENDIX A – COMPONENT SUMMARY/ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION FOR EACH OF THE EIGHT PARTICIPATING
LOCAL SCHOOL DIVISIONS**

Albemarle County

Virginia LEA: Albemarle County - Region V					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	445,840	480,956	516,516	541,554	566,593
Accountability	361,417	397,558	433,700	469,842	505,983
Technical Assistance	210,485	231,534	251,562	263,646	280,990
Supplemental Services/School Choice	1,433	-	1,577	1,720	1,863
High Quality Educators	79,969	92,976	164,073	106,855	113,578
Data Management	8,582	24,331	60,179	161,027	161,875
NCLB Administration	71,679	78,847	86,014	93,182	62,224
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	1,179,405	1,306,201	1,513,621	1,637,827	1,693,108
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	12,272	12,272	12,272	12,272	12,272
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	96	106	123	133	138

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

Fairfax County

Virginia LEA: Fairfax County - Region IV					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	11,593,421	12,655,498	17,181,896	18,387,949	22,398,543
Accountability	4,344,059	4,915,133	5,228,274	5,368,026	5,562,881
Technical Assistance	634,095	609,868	376,826	393,782	415,443
Supplemental Services/School Choice	356,586	438,850	844,599	905,236	982,877
High Quality Educators	4,202,572	4,924,761	5,141,135	5,326,593	6,134,067
Data Management	962,783	1,138,496	1,304,820	1,297,538	1,313,548
NCLB Administration	2,299,600	2,966,451	2,999,881	3,040,040	3,133,214
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	24,393,116	27,649,058	33,077,431	34,719,164	39,940,573
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	158,483	158,483	158,483	158,483	158,483
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	154	174	209	219	252

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

THE IMPACT OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT ON FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This information has been provided directly by the division to supplement the information provided in the full report and facilitate a greater understanding of the challenges facing the division in implementing the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

The Compliance Challenge

The broad objectives of NCLB mirror the pre-established mission of Fairfax County Public Schools. Division policymakers have long championed the cause of high achievement among all student demographic groups. A commitment to recruiting, training, and retaining high quality educators has also been a time-honored trademark of the division. Virginia's accountability framework reinforced these objectives but, to some extent, constrained the range of approaches available to division policymakers to achieve them. The federal accountability framework, as articulated through NCLB, further constrains both state and local leaders. The adaptation process is cumbersome and costly.

Before NCLB was enacted, the local curriculum was already aligned with Virginia's Standards of Learning requirements. Schools were accustomed to achieving high pass rates on annual exams in order to achieve state accreditation. NCLB has ushered in a host of more specific demands for schools to address. The Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Test has to be administered two times a year to each limited-English-proficient (LEP) student in every grade from kindergarten on up. The speaking aspect of these assessments must be administered in a format requiring one-on-one teacher-to-student attention. It can be quite time consuming to carry out this process twice annually in a school that has hundreds of children to test, as many Fairfax County schools do. The staff qualified to carry out this requirement is always very small, so that the school must sacrifice valuable instructional time or the division must budget funds to hire far more teachers than state guidelines presume to be necessary. The total value of the time devoted to the SELP testing is \$5.4 million a year.

The NCLB, in its original form, is over 1,000 pages long. Subsequent amendments have added hundreds of additional pages to digest. The law has a variety of provisions that call for differentiated responses depending on the particular pattern of student performance results in each school. Policymakers face a challenge as they attempt to communicate this information effectively. The school division lengthened the standard teacher contract from 194 days to 195 just to allow for extra training time. The cost of setting aside a single day to train the roughly 14,000 teachers in the division on the law's complex requirements is equivalent to the cost of hiring 72 additional teachers. The law

also affects paraprofessionals: an extra day's training equates to the cost of hiring about ten additional instructional assistants. There are roughly 1,000 administrators who require training as well. A day's training represents the cost for four additional assistant principals. Thus, each day out of the year that is set aside to explain the law results in a missed opportunity to assign 86 instructional personnel year-round to interface directly with the community's children and work directly to address their academic needs.

The law's emphasis on gauging the relative performance of seven subcategories of children has necessitated the development of an elaborate data warehouse. A variety of staff positions have been added to create this system and maintain it. A number of other positions have been required to interpret the mass of data, meet state accountability reporting requirements, and craft strategies for responding appropriately to the student performance results. Similarly, the precise requirements of the highly qualified educator provisions in the federal law have necessitated costly enhancements to the automated personnel system. Additional staff have been hired to track all the extra data required.

In addition, complications arise because the state's performance standards to achieve accreditation status differ from those used to determine whether adequate yearly progress has been achieved under federal law. Two sets of evaluation processes must be carried out.

Public communication costs have increased as a result of the federal legislation. The dissemination and effective explanation of student assessment results is problematic under the federal framework, with its 29 criteria for school success. Few people are experts on the letter or intent of the new law, so school staff members spend considerable time conveying to parents and others in the community the information necessary to understand the meaning of performance results for a given student or school.

NCLB emphasizes inclusiveness in student testing. The process of determining what students can justifiably be exempted from testing, then, is more complex than it was previously. Similarly, the process of determining appropriate accommodations or alternative assessment mechanisms for eligible children is also more complex. In all cases, complexity must be confronted by expending considerable amounts of staff time, which in turn, translates into a higher cost for education.

In many cases, the extra costs cannot be met through budget increases, since growth in school division resources is always limited. This means that the real cost of many of the factors outlined above falls into the category of what an economist would term an "opportunity cost." In other words, resources that would otherwise be devoted to direct instruction are diverted to satisfy the training, tracking, analyzing, reporting, and communicating requirements of the federal legislation.

As schools progress through the federal law's various stages, the problems multiply. The time spent to create and administer school choice and supplemental education services programs could be substantial and is difficult to forecast.

Is The Federal Government A Full Partner?

The explicit compliance costs incurred by Fairfax County Public Schools amounted to \$21 million in the first school year following passage of NCLB. The cost has since risen to \$33 million in the current year, and is projected to reach \$40 million by the 2007-08 school year, representing an annual cost of approximately \$250 per student. The Federal Title I through V programs are earmarked for just 35 of the division's schools, but the law's provisions, and compliance costs, apply at all 198 facilities. It stands to reason, then, that the federal dollars are stretched thin by local policymakers as they confront the challenges of NCLB. Indeed, total revenues from all of the Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) Act programs amounted to roughly \$18.1 million for the 2004-05 year, about 65 percent of the compliance cost.

Even this comparison understates the magnitude of the excess costs, since it makes sense only if one assumes that the purpose of the federal education program is to conduct assessments, as opposed to its traditional mission to enhance instructional attention given to economically disadvantaged children. Furthermore, compliance costs are rising at a much faster pace than the federal resources available to address them. For example, the federal Title I through V program money for Fairfax County Public Schools rose by \$1.7 million from the 2003-2004 year to the 2004-2005 year. At the same time, NCLB compliance costs increased by \$3.3 million, or nearly twice as much.

As the years go by, the situation promises to become even more serious. For the 2005-06 school year, students from three additional grades (4, 6, and 7) will be incorporated into the annual testing process. Over time, the target pass rates for the Standards of Learning exams will increase as well, rising far beyond the traditional level of 70 percent, and, indeed, reaching 100 percent by 2014.

Are There Indirect Cost Impacts Of The No Child Left Behind Act?

In an effort to spur student achievement, local policymakers add their own strategic approaches to those explicitly prescribed by NCLB. Although the law does not require it, there is a trend toward expansion of all-day kindergarten opportunities in the hopes that disadvantaged children will receive greater attention in their most critical formative period. Staffing for the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program has been increased far beyond the state guidelines in an effort to spur these children's academic progress. A number of schools with high populations of economically disadvantaged students have been placed on year-round schedules to prevent the traditional summer learning loss for students who can ill afford it. A variety of remediation programs have been implemented in order to help students master material they did not learn the first time. In turn, formative assessment tools are being developed to identify student performance deficiencies in advance of Standards of Learning test administration periods, so that early corrective intervention may take place.

ADDITIONAL FACTS – FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- Largest school division in Virginia and 12th largest in U.S.
- Over 1,700 teachers hired each school year
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate participation of 47 percent in 2003
- Large number of teachers nationally board certified
- Nearly 60 percent of teachers hold advanced degrees
- Operating budget of \$1.9 billion for FY2006 – includes resources for recruitment and retention, the expansion of full-day kindergarten, instructional coaches, additional technology support, and additional summer school programs – to meet NCLB goals
- Current student demographics are approximately: 10.7 percent African American; .3 percent American Indian; 17.2 percent Asian American; 15.5 percent Hispanic; 4.5 percent Multiracial; and 51.4 percent Caucasian
- Since 2000, the LEP student population has increased by 80 percent
- For fiscal year 2005, FCPS Title I funding decreased from approximately \$12 million to \$9 million

Fredericksburg City

Virginia LEA: Fredericksburg City - Region III					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	90,606	190,272	194,803	199,333	203,863
Accountability	69,659	146,285	149,767	153,250	156,733
Technical Assistance	146,622	307,907	315,238	322,569	329,900
Supplemental Services/School Choice	-	-	-	-	-
High Quality Educators	8,132	13,606	14,186	14,766	15,346
Data Management	15,696	32,962	33,747	34,532	35,317
NCLB Administration	194,625	204,357	214,088	223,819	233,550
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	525,341	895,388	921,829	948,270	974,710
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	2,382	2,382	2,382	2,382	2,382
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	221	376	387	398	409

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

Halifax County

Virginia LEA: Halifax County - Region VIII Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	870,323	1,016,368	1,057,022	1,099,303	1,143,275
Accountability	249,904	291,839	303,513	315,653	328,279
Technical Assistance	397,245	463,905	482,461	501,759	521,830
Supplemental Services/School Choice	17,638	20,598	21,422	22,279	23,170
High Quality Educators	4,336	5,063	5,266	5,477	5,696
Data Management	82,469	96,308	100,161	104,167	108,334
NCLB Administration	110,767	129,354	134,529	139,910	145,506
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	1,732,684	2,023,436	2,104,373	2,188,548	2,276,090
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	5,877	5,877	5,877	5,877	5,877
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	295	344	358	372	387

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

Henrico County

Virginia LEA: Henrico County - Region I					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	735,989	793,954	877,599	888,308	898,308
Accountability	324,317	350,262	364,273	378,843	393,997
Technical Assistance	542,744	586,164	586,164	586,164	586,164
Supplemental Services/School Choice	-	-	-	-	-
High Quality Educators	49,824	53,809	53,809	53,809	53,809
Data Management	-	-	-	-	-
NCLB Administration	2,432,251	2,619,000	2,732,849	2,786,698	2,840,547
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	4,085,125	4,403,190	4,614,694	4,693,823	4,772,826
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	44,762	44,762	44,762	44,762	44,762
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	91	98	103	105	107

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

Norfolk City

Virginia LEA: Norfolk City - Region II					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	1,214,519	330,957	330,957	330,957	330,957
Accountability	462,372	423,905	385,640	385,640	385,640
Technical Assistance	-	-	-	-	-
Supplemental Services/School					
Choice	16,495	16,495	20,619	24,743	32,991
High Quality Educators	639,156	636,377	571,324	606,822	569,424
Data Management	20,225	18,261	18,261	18,261	18,261
NCLB Administration	7,993,121	6,005,127	5,944,766	5,739,974	5,927,801
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	10,345,889	7,431,123	7,271,568	7,106,397	7,265,073
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	34,040	34,040	34,040	34,040	34,040
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	304	218	214	209	213

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

This information has been provided directly by the division to supplement the information provided in the full report and facilitate a greater understanding of the challenges facing the division in implementing the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

ADDITIONAL FACTS – NORFOLK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Demographics

- Urban city in the Hampton Roads area with a population of 225,000 within a metropolitan area of 1.5 million
- Home to the largest naval station in the world
- School division contains approximately 37,000 students and 3,000 teachers
- There are 35 elementary schools, 8 middle schools, 5 high schools, in addition to other auxiliary facilities (including alternative, magnet, and specialty programs)
- School division offers an International Baccalaureate Program
- Current statistics show a graduation rate of 87 percent
- School division has 18 elementary Title I school-wide schools

Current NCLB Challenges

- Attracting and retaining highly qualified staff (teachers, paraprofessionals and principals)
- Providing high quality professional development
- Increasing English language proficiency of LEP students
- Increasing assessment participation rate
- Providing scientifically research-based instructional materials
- Providing research-based prevention/intervention/remediation programs

Strategic Actions Being Undertaken to Ensure NCLB Requirements Continue to be Met

- Providing additional incentives for attracting and retaining high-quality teachers in Title I schools
- Providing high quality professional development for all staff
- Encouraging and supporting teachers to seek additional endorsements when eligible
- Providing additional support for teachers to pass PRAXIS exam in order to be highly-qualified
- Piloting a Title I Summer Book Club for students (home reading program)
- Piloting a Pre-kindergarten Summer Transition Program for students at risk of academic failure
- Increasing opportunities for parental involvement and communication on NCLB
- Providing opportunities for paraprofessionals with instructional duties to become highly-qualified
- Piloting an ESL in-school service model for LEP students
- Training a math resource teacher in each Title I school
- Increasing the number of extended day programs and Saturday academies

Roanoke County

Virginia LEA: Roanoke County - Region VI					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	9,781,838	5,688,367	10,450,850	14,666,930	14,980,194
Accountability	2,633,563	2,608,417	3,226,139	3,226,180	3,253,746
Technical Assistance	2,109,129	2,109,129	2,636,411	3,163,693	3,690,975
Supplemental Services/School Choice	-	-	-	-	-
High Quality Educators	1,434,268	1,463,635	1,534,876	1,606,117	1,677,358
Data Management	629,809	314,904	629,809	787,261	944,713
NCLB Administration	227,122	158,768	182,133	204,171	226,208
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	16,815,729	12,343,220	18,660,218	23,654,352	24,773,194
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004)	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	1,169	858	1,297	1,645	1,723

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia – Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for Operations

This information has been provided directly by the division to supplement the information provided in the full report and facilitate a greater understanding of the challenges facing the division in implementing the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Virginia LEA: Roanoke County - Region VI Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act ESTIMATED COSTS OF PREVENTION STRATEGIES IN ORDER FOR THE DIVISION AND ITS SCHOOLS TO CONTINUE TO MAKE AYP					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	1,700,107	1,734,109	1,768,791	1,804,167	1,840,250
Accountability	1,821,814	1,858,250	1,895,415	1,933,324	1,971,990
Technical Assistance	4,011,286	4,109,096	3,989,060	3,871,019	3,755,014
Supplemental					
Services/School Choice	2,879,586	2,937,178	2,995,921	3,055,840	3,116,956
High Quality Educators	2,083,189	2,124,853	2,167,350	2,210,697	2,254,911
Data Management	1,141,532	1,164,363	1,187,650	1,211,403	1,235,631
NCLB Administration	731,988	746,627	761,560	776,791	792,327
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	14,369,502	14,674,476	14,765,747	14,863,240	14,967,080
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004)	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	999	1,020	1,027	1,033	1,041

Virginia LEA: Roanoke County - Region VI					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
ESTIMATED COSTS ADDING PREVENTION STRATEGIES TO COSTS WITHOUT PREVENTION					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	11,481,945	7,422,476	12,219,641	16,471,097	16,820,444
Accountability	4,455,377	4,466,667	5,121,554	5,159,504	5,225,736
Technical Assistance	6,120,415	6,218,225	6,625,471	7,034,712	7,445,989
Supplemental					
Services/School Choice	2,879,586	2,937,178	2,995,921	3,055,840	3,116,956
High Quality Educators	3,517,457	3,588,488	3,702,226	3,816,814	3,932,269
Data Management	1,771,341	1,479,267	1,817,459	1,998,664	2,180,344
NCLB Administration	959,110	905,395	943,693	980,962	1,018,535
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	31,185,231	27,017,696	33,425,965	38,517,593	39,740,274
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004)	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382	14,382
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	2,168	1,879	2,324	2,678	2,763

Summary of Key Prevention Strategies Identified by Roanoke County:

- Disaggregating data to identify and address individual student areas of improvement and develop plans for student remediation efforts
- Providing remediation to students, including a provision for transportation
- Expanding current efforts regarding parental communication
- Providing small group tutoring (and occasional one-on-one tutoring) to improve student achievement
- Providing study groups for students with disabilities
- Lowering student/teacher ratios beyond what has been reported as NCLB additional costs without prevention – to further student achievement
- Assisting families of truant children through early intervention
- Providing additional distance learning opportunities – especially to homebound students – in order to provide for the continuity of instruction when students are unable to come to school
- Enhancing efforts to provide benchmark assessments that provide meaningful SOL test predictor information to teachers and administrators
- Enhancing current efforts related to the on-going evaluation of students
- Enhancing current lesson planning through the use and interpretation of student data
- Ensuring that curricula are continually evaluated for alignment with state standards

Washington County

Virginia LEA: Washington County - Region VII					
Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act					
Component Summary	Year One 7/03-6/04	Year Two 7/04-6/05	Year Three 7/05-6/06	Year Four 7/06-6/07	Year Five 7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	180,282	179,457	179,457	161,854	156,209
Accountability	61,810	61,810	61,810	61,810	61,810
Technical Assistance	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000
Supplemental Services/School Choice	103,447	103,447	103,447	103,447	103,447
High Quality Educators	14,109	15,215	15,215	15,215	15,215
Data Management	-	-	-	-	-
NCLB Administration	14,634	1,370	1,370	1,370	1,370
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	440,282	427,299	427,299	409,696	404,052
AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (End-of-Year for 2003-2004) ¹	7,176	7,176	7,176	7,176	7,176
AVERAGE COSTS PER PUPIL	61	60	60	57	56

¹ – Figure from Fiscal Year 2004 – Table 15 of the Superintendents' Annual Report For Virginia –
Sources of Financial Support for Expenditures for Operations and Total Per Pupil Expenditures for
Operations

APPENDIX B – EXPLANATION OF SEA CONTRIBUTION TO LOCAL EFFORTS AS SHOWN IN FIGURE 2 OF THE APA REPORT

Estimated New NCLB Costs Related to the Federal No Child Left Behind Act				
	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Component Summary	7/04-6/05	7/05-6/06	7/06-6/07	7/07-6/08
Standards and Assessments	7,301,848	7,757,157	7,704,659	8,247,224
Accountability	282,994	288,978	298,997	308,716
Technical Assistance	1,971,770	2,098,513	2,123,506	2,140,320
Supplemental Services/School Choice	384,144	404,530	1,206,468	1,206,272
High Quality Educators	3,378,530	3,887,031	2,834,743	2,896,795
Data Management	2,997,776	400,000	400,000	400,000
NCLB Administration	4,622,812	5,345,826	5,385,468	5,411,147
TOTAL IDENTIFIED NEW NCLB COSTS	20,939,872	20,182,034	19,953,841	20,610,475
Total Deductions – SEA Costs Not Directly Linked to LEA Support/Technical Assistance	8,736,848	9,317,157	8,429,659	8,972,224
New NCLB Costs Attributable Directly to LEA Service (Total Identified New NCLB Costs - Total Deductions for Services Not Directly Linked to LEA Support/Technical Assistance)	12,203,025	10,864,878	11,524,182	11,638,251
State General Funds Provided for NCLB Requirements for Student Record Collection Database (beginning in fiscal year 2005-2006)	0	3,250,591	3,250,591	3,250,591
State General Funds Initiatives Directly Linked to NCLB (Mentoring & Induction, Virginia Teacher Corps, Turnaround Specialists, Virtual AP, and Leadership Development Grants)	2,414,375	4,633,379	4,633,379	4,633,379
TOTAL STATE CONTRIBUTION TO LOCAL EFFORTS (New NCLB Costs Attributable + Costs for Student Record Collection Database + State General Funds Initiatives Linked to NCLB)	14,617,400	18,748,848	19,408,152	19,522,221

APPENDIX C – GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Achievement Gap: Differences in academic performance among student groups.

Accommodation: An accommodation is an adjustment or allowance made during SOL testing to meet a particular need of an individual student, in accordance with an IEP, §504, or LEP plan. There are standard and non-standard accommodations. Standard accommodations allow the student to take a test in a different manner without changing what the test measures (e.g., Braille, auditory tests). Nonstandard accommodations significantly change what the test measures.

Academic Reviews: The School-Level Academic Review is a process designed to help schools rated Accredited with Warning identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The focus of the review is on systems, processes, and practices that are being implemented at the school and division levels. The team conducts the review according to indicators that are based on state laws and regulations as well as research-based best practices. Based on their findings, the team provides the school and the division with information that can be used to develop, revise, and implement the school's three-year improvement plan (SIP), as required by the Standards of Accreditation (SOA). Review teams are usually appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction but, under certain circumstances, may be appointed by a division superintendent.

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO): The annual target for the percentage of students whose test scores must be at the level of proficient or above in English/language arts and mathematics. Meeting the AMO is the first step toward demonstrating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB.

Augenblick, Palaich, and Associates, Inc. (APA): The Denver-based consulting firm hired by the CCSSO to develop a model framework for states participating in the cost consortium to use in determining the activities required to implement NCLB and their associated costs.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): A goal of the 2001 NCLB that requires schools and districts to measure and report students' annual progress toward 100 percent proficiency in English/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014. Progress is based on whether the school or division met its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) and demonstrated 95 percent participation on standardized tests, achieved its target on the Academic Performance Index, and, for high schools, met target graduation rates.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO): A nationwide, nonprofit organization composed of officials who head each state's department of elementary and secondary education.

Dissaggregated Data: Test results sorted by groups of students. Groups include students who are economically disadvantaged, from racial and ethnic groups, have special education needs, or have limited English proficiency. Disaggregated data allow parents and teachers to see more than just the average score for a student's school—it also shows how each student group is performing.

Education Information Management System (EIMS): The statewide student information system developed and maintained by the Virginia Department of Education.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): This term refers to the primary federal law affecting K-12 education. Congress reauthorizes it every six years. The most recent authorization is also referred to as the NCLB Act, approved by Congress in 2001 and signed into law by President George W. Bush in January 2002.

Federal Impact Aid – Payments for Federal Property to assist local school districts that have lost a portion of their local tax base because of Federal ownership of property. To be eligible, a school district must demonstrate that the Federal Government has acquired real property with an assessed valuation of at least 10 percent of all real property in the district at the time of acquisition.

Highly qualified: This term refers to a teacher who has obtained full state teacher certification and has demonstrated subject matter competency. All teachers of federal core academic subjects hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year and teaching in a program supported with Title I, Part A, funds must be "highly qualified." All teachers of core academic subjects are to be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Individualized Education Program (IEP): "Individualized education program" (IEP) means a written statement for a child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a team meeting in accordance with federal regulations. The IEP specifies the individual educational needs of the child and what special education and related services are necessary to meet the needs.

Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): Federal law has guided the delivery of special education services for students with disabilities since enactment of the *Education for All Handicapped Children Act* (P. L. 94-142) in 1975. The law pledged the availability of federal funding for states to provide a "free and appropriate public education" for every school-age child with a disability. Renamed the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 1990, and reauthorized in 1997 and again in 2004, the act emphasizes quality teaching, learning, and the establishment of high expectations for disabled children. The IDEA also strengthened the role of parents in the educational planning process, endorsed meaningful access to the general curriculum, and delineated how school disciplinary rules and the obligation to provide a free appropriate public education for disabled children fit together.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP): This term refers to students for whom English is a second language and who are not reading or writing English at their grade level.

Local Education Agency (LEA): This is the term used by federal education law to describe a local school division.

NCLB Act (No Child Left Behind): Federal legislation, signed into law in 2001 that requires states to demonstrate progress from year to year in raising the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and mathematics and in narrowing the achievement gap. NCLB sets five performance goals for states:

- All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014.
- All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers by 2005-2006.
- All students will learn in schools that are safe and drug free.
- All students will graduate from high school.

The purpose of the Act is “to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice so that no child is left behind.”

Nonpersonal Services: All services (costs) provided to or by state agencies that do not involve a direct charge for salaried or wage employees. Examples of nonpersonal services include contracts, conferences, equipment, and supplies. This term is used only in the SEA cost study.

Parental Involvement: The participation of parents in regular, two-way, meaningful communication involving students’ academic learning and other school activities. The involvement includes ensuring that parents play an integral role in their child’s learning; that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child’s education at school; that parents are full partners in their child’s education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees. Parental involvement is one of the components of NCLB.

Personal Services: Salary, fringe, and wage costs related to personnel of state agencies. This term is used only in the SEA cost study.

School Choice – Title I schools identified as needing improvement have to provide the option for students to transfer within the division to a school that has made AYP. The school division is required to provide transportation to those students. The law requires that priority in school choice be given to low-achieving children from low-income families. However, if all public schools served by the district are classified as schools in need of improvement, the district should try to establish a cooperative agreement with other districts in order to provide school choice.

Schools in Improvement Status – A Title I school that fails to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets defined by the state for two or more years is classified as in need of improvement and is subject to the following consequences:

Schools in Need of Improvement in Year 1 - Title I schools in Year 1 of Title I School Improvement Status must adopt effective instructional practices and inform parents of their rights under the law, including the option of transferring their children to a higher performing public school.

Schools in Need of Improvement in Year 2 - A Title I school identified for improvement that does not make AYP in the same subject area for three consecutive years enters Year 2 of Title I School Improvement Status. Title I schools in Year 2 of Title I School Improvement Status must offer students supplemental educational services, such as tutoring, and continue to offer transfers to higher performing public schools.

Schools in Need of Improvement -- Year 3 (Corrective Action) - A Title I school identified for improvement that does not make AYP in the same subject area for four consecutive years enters Year Three of Title I School Improvement Status. Title I schools in Year Three of Title I School Improvement Status must take corrective action as specified in the federal law, and continue to offer students supplemental education services and transfer options to higher performing public schools.

Schools in Need of Improvement -- Year 4 (Restructuring-planning) - School divisions must initiate restructuring plans for Title I schools that move into Year Four of Title I School Improvement. Restructuring plans for Title I schools may include: 1) reopening the school as a charter school; 2) replacing staff relevant to the school's failure to make progress; or 3) Turning the management of the school over to a private educational management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness.

Schools in Need of Improvement -- Year 5 or more (Restructuring-implementation) - Restructuring plans would be implemented if a Title I school fails again to make AYP in the same subject area during 2005-2006 and moves into year five of improvement status. Title I schools in Year Four of Title I School Improvement also must continue to offer public school choice and supplemental services.

Standards of Accreditation (SOA): As authorized in the SOQ (§22.1-253.13:3 of the Code of Virginia), the Standards of Accreditation are the Board of Education's regulations that establish criteria for approving public schools in Virginia.

Standards of Learning (SOL): The Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools (SOL) describe the commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12 in English, mathematics, science, history/ social science, technology, the fine arts, foreign language, health and physical education, and driver education.

Standards of Quality (SOQ): The Constitution of Virginia requires the Board of Education to determine and prescribe standards of quality for the public schools of Virginia, subject to revision only by the General Assembly. These standards are known as the Standards of Quality (SOQ). The SOQ prescribe the minimum foundation

program that all public schools must meet. (See §§22.1-253.13.1 through 22.1-253.12, of the Code of Virginia).

Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP) – The state-approved English language proficiency assessment as required by NCLB. The SELP test, developed by Harcourt Assessment, Inc., assess the speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills of all limited English proficient (LEP) students.

State Education Agency (SEA): This term refers to the Virginia Department of Education and other state departments of education, which under federal law are primarily responsible for the supervision of a state's public elementary and secondary schools.

Supplemental Education Services (SES): Students in a Title I school identified as needing improvement for two consecutive years are eligible to receive outside tutoring. Parents can choose the appropriate services for their child from a list of state-approved providers. The school division must pay for the services using Title I funds.

Teacher Education and Licensure system (TEAL): The statewide database that tracks all teachers, their school(s) of employment, and their professional credentials.

Title I, Part A: This program provides financial assistance through State educational agencies (SEAs) to local educational agencies (LEAs) and public schools with high numbers or percentages of poor children to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards. LEAs target the Title I funds they receive to public schools with the highest percentages of children from low-income families. Unless a participating school is operating a schoolwide program, the school must focus Title I services on children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet state academic standards. Schools enrolling at least 40 percent of students from poor families are eligible to use Title I funds for schoolwide programs that serve all children in the school.

U. S. Department of Education (USED): The federal agency that oversees the implementation of federal laws as they apply to public education in the United States. As a part of this responsibility, USED promulgates regulations to implement laws, such as NCLB, disperses grants appropriated to the states, and monitors compliance.

Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA): An assessment developed to meet the NCLB requirement that all students, including those with disabilities, be assessed on statewide accountability measures for the purpose of measuring AYP. Both the reauthorized IDEA and NCLB require states to create alternate assessments for students who are unable to take the general statewide assessments. NCLB allows creation of an alternate assessment based on grade level content and achievement standards. The VGLA is an alternate assessment evaluated against grade level achievement standards.

Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP): The reauthorized IDEA (2004) requires states to develop an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the general statewide assessment program even with accommodations. Students participating in the VAAP are evaluated against alternate achievement standards aligned to grade level content standards.

Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program (VSEP): An assessment used to enable certain students with unique disabilities to earn credits towards graduation.

504 Plan –The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 (known as "Section 504" or simply "504"). "Section 504" prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability against an "otherwise qualified individual with a disability", who has an impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities by any entity receiving federal financial assistance. This includes public elementary and secondary schools, and essentially all public and private colleges, and others (such as public employers). This plan is developed students who are qualified individuals under §504 but who are eligible for services under IDEA.